

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. In an Office Action dated June 26, 2003, claims 1-15 were rejected. In the present response, Applicants traverse the rejections as follows:

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Duske, Jr. et al (herein "Duske", US 6,292,473). It was alleged that Duske teaches all of Applicants' claim limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Duske teaches a satellite communication system where "proforma" messages are transmitted, received, and processed. A proforma message is a "template form" having data fields. A proforma message identifier is assigned to each proforma message that is defined, so that only the message identifier, and data to fill in the form, is transmitted, thereby minimizing the amount of data that is transmitted over the satellite network.

In the office action dated June 26, 2003, it was alleged that, among other things, Duske teaches a memory for storing field-mapping information in column 3, lines 12-14 and, further, that Duske defines field-mapping information in column 23, lines 35-36. Applicants disagree with these allegations.

The field-mapping information is defined in Applicants' claim 1 as an indication of "information to be copied from said formatted message to a response message". In column 3, lines 12-14, Duske teaches a "network form controller storing a plurality of message forms each having a form identifier and a form definition specifying a predetermined format...". In other words, a number of message forms are stored at a network controller, each of the message forms having a form identifier and information specifying what kind of data is present, how it is presented, etc. There is no mention whatsoever that the form identifier or form definition is used to identify information to be copied into a response message.

In column 23, lines 35-36, it was alleged that Duske teaches that field-mapping information indicates information to be copied from a formatted message to a response message. Applicants disagree. This section of Duske reads as follows:

“The ‘reply proforma identifier’ attribute will designate another user message proforma.”

This text simply teaches that each proforma message comprises an attribute that identifies a corresponding response proforma. This does not teach or suggest identifying information from the first proforma to be copied into the response proforma.

With regard to the other two independent claims at issue, claims 7 and 12, Applicants believe that Duske fails to teach at least the element of “identifying one or more information fields of said formatted message to be copied into a response message”. While Duske does teach identifying corresponding response messages for each proforma message in the system, Duske is silent in terms of identifying information in a formatted message to be copied into a response message.

Finally, Applicants believe that all other claims, being dependent on what Applicants perceive to be allowable claims, are likewise allowable.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 25, 2003

By: 

Thomas M. Thibault, Reg. No. 42,181
(858) 651-2356

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502